arXiv:1402.0602v2 [quant-ph] 21 May 2014

Tight Bounds on Accessible Information and Informational Power

Michele Dall'Arno,[1] Francesco Buscemi,[1,2] and Masanao Ozawa[1]

[1] *Graduate School of Information Science, Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601, Japan*
[2] *Institute for Advanced Research, Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan*

(Dated: May 22, 2014)

The accessible information quantifies the amount of classical information that can be extracted from an ensemble of quantum states. Analogously, the informational power quantifies the amount of classical information that can be extracted by a quantum measurement. For both quantities, we provide upper and lower bounds that depend only on the dimension of the system, and we prove their tightness. In the case of symmetric informationally complete (SIC) ensembles and measurements, stronger bounds are provided and their tightness proved for qubits and qutrits. From our upper bounds, we notice, perhaps surprisingly, that the statistics generated by SIC ensembles or measurements in arbitrary dimension, though optimal for tomographic purposes, in fact never contain more than just one bit of information, the rest being constituted by completely random bits. On the other hand, from our lower bounds, we obtain an explicit strategy beating the so-called "pretty-good" one for the extraction of mutual information in the case of SIC ensembles and measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum theory poses bounds on the amount of classical information that can be extracted from an ensemble of quantum states or by a quantum measurement, and the problem of quantifying such bounds lies at the heart of many important aspects of the theory. From a fundamental viewpoint, it has implications in fields such as quantum measurement theory [1], entropic uncertainty relations [2–6], or the informational axiomatization of quantum theory [7, 8]. On the other hand, in applications it is often important to implement preparations and measurements that achieve those bounds in order to optimally perform tasks such as information locking [4], private quantum decoupling [9, 10], purification of noisy quantum measurements [11], randomness generation [12], classical communication over quantum channels [12], storage and retrieval of information from quantum memories [12], and quantum error correction [13, 14].

The problem of quantifying how much information can be extracted from an ensemble of quantum states was first addressed almost half a century ago, and is usually referred to as the accessible information problem [15–23]. Since exact solutions to this problem are known only for some restricted classes of symmetric preparations, tight upper and lower bounds - known as the Holevo-Yuen-Ozawa bound [16, 22] and the subentropy bound [23], respectively - can often be extremely useful. We note however that, even for highly symmetric preparations like the so-called *tetrahedral preparation* first introduced by Davies [19], the analytic evaluation of the accessible information remained an open problem for long time [24].

Very recently, a "dual" problem to that of accessible information has been introduced, as the problem of quantifying how much information can be extracted by a quantum measurement (i.e. its *informational power*) [24]. Despite the usefulness of such dual approach [24–29] (leading e.g. to the analytic evaluation [24, 25, 28] of the accessible information of the tetrahedral preparation), tight upper and lower bounds on the informational power of a quantum measurement are still lacking.

The tetrahedral configuration for qubits is generalized to higher dimensions by what are called *symmetric informationally complete* (SIC) preparations and measurements [30]. SIC quantum measurements [30–32] were introduced as useful tools for quantum tomography, quantum cryptography [33–38], and classical signal processing [39], but it has been argued that they also play a fundamental role in characterizing the structure of quantum state space [32]. Despite numerous efforts, many important properties of SIC measurements, not last their existence in any dimension, are still unanswered problems. Therefore, any approach that can shed new light on SIC measurements may lead to a better understanding of their structure.

The purpose of this work is twofold. First, we provide tight upper and lower bounds, depending only on the dimension of the system, on the accessible information and the informational power of any preparation and measurement. While both upper and lower bounds for accessible information can be trivially saturated, we find that, for the case of in-

formational power, the lower bound is saturated by a non-trivial measurement that we name "Scrooge" following Ref. [23]. Second, we focus on the case of SIC preparations and measurements, providing stronger upper and lower bounds on accessible information and informational power, and proving their tightness in the case of qubits and qutrits. As a corollary of our upper bound, we show that the accessible information and the informational power of SIC preparations and measurements are always upper bounded by one bit. In this sense, therefore, the statistics generated by SIC preparations or SIC measurements, though optimal for tomographic purposes, are (perhaps surprisingly) constituted by almost completely random bits. As a corollary of our lower bound, we provide a strategy for the extraction of mutual information from SIC ensembles or by SIC measurements, which beats the so-called "pretty-good" one [40–43].

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we provide our first main result, namely tight upper and lower bounds on the accessible information and informational power for arbitrary preparations and measurements, as a function of the dimension only. In Sec. III we provide our second main result, namely upper and lower bounds on the accessible information and informational power for SIC preparations and measurements. For qubits and qutrits we prove tightness in Sec. III A. We conclude the paper discussing some open problems in Sec. IV.

II. BOUNDS FOR ARBITRARY ENSEMBLES AND MEASUREMENTS

In this Section we provide upper and lower bounds on the accessible information (resp., informational power) of arbitrary preparations (resp., measurements).

Let us recall some basic definitions [44] from classical information theory. A random variable X is a function that maps from its domain, the sample space, to its range, the real numbers, according to a probability distribution (probability density for the continuous case) $p(X{=}x)$. Given a random variable X, the Shannon entropy $H(X)$ defined as

$$H(X) := -\sum_x p(X{=}x) \log p(X{=}x),$$

for the discrete case, or

$$H(X) := -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx\ p(X{=}x) \log p(X{=}x),$$

for the continuous case, is a measure of the lack of information about the outcome of X. We write log for binary logarithms and ln for natural logarithms, and we express informational quantities in bits. Given two random variables X and Y, the joint Shannon entropy $H(X,Y)$ is defined as

$$H(X,Y) := -\sum_{x,y} p(X{=}x, Y{=}y) \log p(X{=}x, Y{=}y),$$

for the discrete case, or

$$H(X,Y) := -\iint_{-\infty}^{\infty} dxdy\ p(X{=}x, Y{=}y) \log p(X{=}x, Y{=}y)$$

for the continuous case, and is a measure of the lack of information about the joint outcomes of X and Y. The conditional Shannon entropy $H(X|Y)$ defined as $H(Y|X) := H(X,Y) - H(X)$ is a measure of the lack of information about the outcome of X given the knowledge of the outcome of Y. The *mutual information* $I(X;Y)$ defined as $I(X;Y) := H(X) + H(Y) - H(X,Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X) = H(X) - H(X|Y)$ is a measure of correlation between X and Y, or, equivalently, a measure of how much information about each random variable is carried by the other one.

Let us recall some basic definitions [12] from quantum information theory. Any quantum system is associated to an Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and we denote with $L(\mathcal{H})$ the space of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. We will consider only finite dimensional Hilbert spaces. A *state* ρ is a positive semidefinite operator in $L(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho] \leq 1$. Any preparation of a quantum system is described by an *ensemble*. In the discrete (resp., continuous) case, an ensemble is an operator valued measurable function $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ from real numbers x to states $\rho_x \in L(\mathcal{H})$, associated with a probability distribution (resp., probability density), such that $\sum_x \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x] = 1$ (resp., $\int_x dx\, \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x] = 1$). We will call any ensemble of rank-one states a *rank-one ensemble*. For any Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the continuous ensemble uniformly distributed according to Haar measure [45, 46] is sometimes called *Scrooge ensemble* [23].

An *effect* Π is a positive semidefinite operator in $L(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\Pi \leq \mathbb{1}$. Any measurement on a quantum system is described by a *probability operator-valued measure* (POVM) [16]. In the discrete (resp., continuous) case, a POVM is an operator valued measurable function $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ from real numbers y to effects $\Pi_y \in L(\mathcal{H})$, such that $\sum_y \Pi_y = \mathbb{1}$ (resp., $\int_y dy \Pi_y = \mathbb{1}$), where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the identity operator. We will call any POVM

of rank-one effects a *rank-one POVM*. In analogy with [23], for any Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, we call the continuous POVM uniformly distributed according to Haar measure [45, 46] the *Scrooge POVM*.

Given an ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ and a POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$, the joint probability $P(X{=}x, Y{=}y)$ of state ρ_x and outcome Π_y is given by the Born rule, namely $P(X{=}x, Y{=}y) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x \Pi_y]$, and the mutual information $I(X;Y)$ is usually denoted with $I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$. Given an Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ and an ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ on $\mathcal{K}$ with average state $\rho := \sum_x \rho_x$, or $\rho := \int_x dx \rho_x$ in the continuous case, call P the orthogonal projector on $\mathcal{H} := \mathrm{supp}\, \rho$. Then for any POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ on $\mathcal{K}$ one has that

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x \Pi_y] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x P \Pi_y P], \qquad \forall x, y,$$

since $\rho_x = P \rho_x P$ for any x. Since $\int_y dy P \Pi_y P = P$ (i. e. $\sum_y P \Pi_y P = P$ in the discrete case) and $P \Pi_y P \geq 0$ for any y, one has that $\{P \Pi_y P\}$ is a POVM on $\mathcal{H}$ with same joint probability. Therefore we can limit ourselves, without loss of generality, to ensembles $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ such that the average state ρ is *invertible* (or *faithful* [47]), namely to be defined on $\mathcal{H}$ with $\mathcal{H} := \mathrm{supp}\, \rho$. Given an ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ with average state ρ, then $\{\rho^{-1/2} \rho_x \rho^{-1/2}\}$ is a POVM, sometimes called pretty-good POVM [40–43] for $\mathcal{E}$ or ρ^{-1}-distortion [23]. Given a POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ and a normalized state ρ, then $\{\rho^{1/2} \Pi_y \rho^{1/2}\}$ is an ensemble with average state ρ, sometimes called pretty-good ensemble for $\mathcal{E}$ or ρ-distortion.

The accessible information [15] was introduced as a measure of how much information can be extracted from an ensemble.

Definition 1 (Accessible Information)**.** *The accessible information $A(\mathcal{E})$ of a discrete or continuous ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ is the supremum over any discrete or continuous POVM $\mathcal{P}$ of the mutual information $I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, namely*

$$A(\mathcal{E}) := \sup_{\mathcal{P}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P}).$$

Any POVM $\mathcal{P}$ that attains the accessible information is called maximally informative for the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$.

The informational power [24] was introduced as a measure of how much information can be extracted by a POVM.

Definition 2 (Informational Power)**.** *The informational power $W(\mathcal{P})$ of a discrete or continuous POVM $\mathcal{P}$ is the supremum over any discrete or continuous ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ of the mutual information $I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, namely*

$$W(\mathcal{P}) := \sup_{\mathcal{E}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P}).$$

Any ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ that attains the informational power is called maximally informative for the POVM $\mathcal{P}$.

The following Lemma, appearing also in Ref. [24], provides a fundamental relation between accessible information and informational power.

Lemma 1. *For any discrete or continuous POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$, the informational power $W(\mathcal{P})$ is the supremum over normalized states ρ of the accessible information of the ensemble $\{\rho^{1/2} \Pi_y \rho^{1/2}\}$, namely*

$$W(\mathcal{P}) = \sup_{\rho} A(\{\rho^{1/2} \Pi_y \rho^{1/2}\}). \tag{1}$$

Proof. For both the discrete or continuous case, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mathcal{P}) &= \sup_{\mathcal{E}} I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P}) \\ &= \sup_{\mathcal{E}} I(\{\rho^{-1/2} \rho_x \rho^{-1/2}\}, \{\rho^{1/2} \Pi_y \rho^{1/2}\}) \\ &= \sup_{\rho} A(\{\rho^{1/2} \Pi_y \rho^{1/2}\}), \end{aligned}$$

where first equality follows from Definition 2; second equality follows from the identity $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x \Pi_y] = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho^{-1/2} \rho_x \rho^{-1/2} \rho^{1/2} \Pi_y \rho^{1/2}]$; third equality follows from Definition 1. □

We can now provide the first main result of this work.

Theorem 1 (Bounds for arbitrary ensembles and POVMs)**.** *For any d-dimensional discrete or continuous rank-one ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ with average state ρ and any d-dimensional discrete or continuous rank-one POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ one has that*

$$0 \leq A(\mathcal{E}) \leq \log(d), \tag{2}$$

and

$$\log(d) - \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \sum_{n=2}^{d} \frac{1}{n} \leq W(\mathcal{P}) \leq \log(d), \tag{3}$$

Lower and upper bounds in Eq. (2) *are saturated, respectively, when $\rho_x \propto \rho$ for all x, and when $\rho_x = \frac{1}{d} |e_x\rangle\langle e_x|$ for some orthonormal basis $|e_x\rangle$. Lower and upper bounds in Eq.* (3) *are saturated, respectively, when $\mathcal{P}$ is the Scrooge POVM and when $\Pi_y = |e_y\rangle\langle e_y|$ for some orthonormal basis $|e_y\rangle$.*

Proof. Lower bound in Eq. (2) follows from the non-negativity of mutual information.

Upper bound in Eq. (2) is the well known Holevo-Yuen-Ozawa bound [16, 22].

Let us prove the lower bound in Eq. (3). One has that

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{P}\text{ is rank-1}} W(\mathcal{P}) &= \inf_{\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{P}\text{ is rank-1}} \sup_{\rho} A(\{\rho^{1/2}\Pi_y\rho^{1/2}\}) \\ &= \sup_{\rho} A(\{\rho^{1/2}\Pi^*_y\rho^{1/2}\}) \\ &= \log(d) - \frac{1}{\ln(2)}\sum_{n=2}^{d}\frac{1}{n},\end{aligned}$$

where first equality follows from Lemma (1); second equality follows from the fact proved in Sec. II and Sec. III of Ref. [23] that the infimum over $\mathcal{P}$ for any ρ is attained when $\mathcal{P}$ is the Scrooge POVM $\mathcal{P}^* = \{\Pi^*_y\}$, and thus infimum and supremum commute; third equality follows from the fact proved in Sec. IV of Ref. [23] that the supremum over ρ, in the case of Scrooge POVM, is attained when $\rho = \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{1}$. The lower bound in Eq. (3) is then proved.

Let us prove the upper bound in Eq. (3). By absurd suppose that there exists a POVM $\mathcal{P}^*$ such that $W(\mathcal{P}^*) > \log(d)$, and call $\mathcal{E}^*$ its maximally informative ensemble. Then $A(\mathcal{E}^*) \geq W(\mathcal{P}^*) > \log(d)$ contradicting Holevo-Yuen-Ozawa bound. The upper bound in Eq. (3) is then proved. □

Notice that, if the hypotheses on the rank of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are dropped in Theorem 1, while Eq. 2 still holds, the lower bound in Eq. (3) does not hold anymore and must be replaced with the bound $0 \leq W(\mathcal{P})$, which is trivially saturated when $\Pi_y \propto \mathbb{1}$ for all y. Finally, notice that the expression in the left hand side of Eq. (3) appeared in Eq. (42) of a very recent work [28] by Słomczyński and Szymusiak as the average value of the *relative entropy of measurement* over all pure states.

III. BOUNDS FOR SIC ENSEMBLES AND SIC MEASUREMENTS

In this Section we provide upper and lower bounds on the accessible information (resp., informational power) of rank-one SIC ensembles (resp., rank-one SIC POVMs).

Let us first introduce symmetric informationally complete (SIC) sets of operators.

Definition 3 (SIC set of operators)**.** *A d-dimensional set $X = \{X_x\}_{x=1}^{d^2}$ of d^2 rank-one positive operators X_x satisfying $\mathrm{Tr}[X_x] = \lambda$ for any x and for some λ and $\mathrm{Tr}[X_xX_y] = \frac{\lambda^2}{d+1}$ for any $x \neq y$ is called symmetric informationally complete (SIC) set of operators.*

The following Lemma, appearing also in Ref. [32], provides a fundamental property of SIC set of operators.

Lemma 2. *For any d-dimensional SIC set $X = \{X_x\}$ of operators X_x with $\mathrm{Tr}[X_x] = \lambda$, the average operator $\bar{X} := \sum_x X_x$ is $\bar{X} = d\lambda\mathbb{1}$.*

Proof. For any operator A we have that $\mathrm{Tr}[A^\dagger A] = 0$ if and only if $A = 0$. Taking $A = d\lambda\mathbb{1} - \bar{X}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}[(d\lambda\mathbb{1} - \bar{X})^2] \\ =&d^2\lambda^2\,\mathrm{Tr}[\mathbb{1}] + \mathrm{Tr}[\bar{X}^2] - 2d\lambda\,\mathrm{Tr}[\bar{X}] \\ =&d^3\lambda^2 + d^2\lambda^2 + \frac{d^2(d^2-1)}{d+1}\lambda^2 - 2d^3\lambda^2 \\ =&0.\end{aligned}$$

by noticing that $\mathrm{Tr}[\bar{X}] = \sum_{x=1}^{d^2}\lambda = d^2\lambda$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[\bar{X}^2] = \sum_x \lambda^2 + \sum_{x\neq y}\frac{\lambda^2}{d+1} = d^2\lambda^2 + \frac{d^2(d^2-1)}{d+1}\lambda^2$. □

Definition 4 (SIC Ensemble)**.** *A d-dimensional SIC set $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ of operators ρ_x with $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x] = \frac{1}{d^2}$ is called symmetric informationally complete (SIC) ensemble.*

Definition 5 (SIC POVM)**.** *A d-dimensional SIC set $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ of operators Π_y with $\mathrm{Tr}[\Pi_y] = \frac{1}{d}$ is called symmetric informationally complete (SIC) POVM.*

Notice that Lemma 2 ensures that the average state of any SIC ensemble is $\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{1}$ and that in Definition 5 the necessary condition $\sum_y \Pi_y = \mathbb{1}$ is automatically granted. Notice also that given any SIC POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_x\}$, one has that $\{\frac{1}{d}\Pi_x\}$ is a SIC ensemble. Analogously, given any SIC ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$, one has that $\{d\rho_x\}$ is a SIC POVM, since the average state of any SIC ensemble is $\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{1}$. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between SIC POVMs and SIC ensembles given by renormalization.

We can now provide the second main result of this work.

Theorem 2 (Bounds for SIC ensembles and SIC POVMs)**.** *For any d-dimensional SIC ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ and any d-dimensional SIC POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ one has that*

$$\log(d) - \frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_{n=2}^{d}\frac{1}{n} \leq A(\mathcal{E}) \leq \log\frac{2d}{d+1}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\log(d) - \frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_{n=2}^{d}\frac{1}{n} \leq W(\mathcal{P}) \leq \log\frac{2d}{d+1}. \qquad (5)$$

Proof. The lower bound in Eq. (5) follows from Eq. (3).

Let us prove the upper bound in Eq. (5). Upon introducing an ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$ and two random variables X and Y such that $p(X{=}x) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x]$ and $p(X{=}x, Y{=}y) = \mathrm{Tr}[\rho_x \Pi_y]$, we have $I(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P}) = I(X;Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X)$. Entropy $H(Y)$ is trivially upper bounded by $H(Y) \leq \log(d^2)$. Since the entropy $H(Y|X{=}x)$ is lower bounded by $H(Y|X{=}x) \geq \log(d(d+1)/2)$ as proven in a recent interesting work by Rastegin [48], the conditional entropy $H(Y|X) = \sum_x p(X{=}x) H(Y|X{=}x)$ is lower bounded by $H(Y|X) \geq \log(d(d+1)/2)$. The upper bound in Eq. (5) is then proved.

The upper bound in Eq. (4) follows from the upper bound in Eq. (5) and from Lemma 1.

Let us prove the lower bound in Eq. (4). One has that

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\mathcal{E}|\mathcal{E}\text{ is SIC}} A(\mathcal{E}) &\geq \inf_{\mathcal{P}|\mathcal{P}\text{ is rank-1}} A\left(\frac{1}{d}\mathcal{P}\right) \\ &= \log(d) - \frac{1}{\ln(2)}\sum_{n=2}^{d}\frac{1}{n}.\end{aligned}$$

where first inequality follows from the fact that the set of SIC ensembles is a subset of the set of rank-one ensembles with average state $\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{1}$ due to Lemma 2; second equality follows from the fact proved in Sec. II and III of Ref. [23] that the infimum over $\mathcal{P}$ is attained when $\mathcal{P}$ is the Scrooge POVM. The lower bound in Eq. (3) is then proved. □

Notice that, for any dimension d, the lower bound on accessible information and informational power given by Eqs. (4) and (5) are tighter than those provided by the pretty-good POVM and ensemble. Indeed, for any d-dimensional SIC ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}$, the corresponding pretty-good POVM is $\{d\rho_x\}$; analogously, for any d-dimensional SIC POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_x\}$, the corresponding pretty-good ensemble is $\{d^{-1}\Pi_x\}$; the mutual information given by the pretty-good strategy is then

$$\begin{aligned}&I(\{\rho_x\}, \{d\rho_x\}) \\ =&I(\{d^{-1}\Pi_x\}, \{\Pi_x\}) \\ =&\frac{2d}{d^2(d+1)}\log d - \frac{d-1}{d^2(d+1)}\log(d+1) \\ \leq&\log d - \frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_{n=2}^{d}\frac{1}{n},\end{aligned}$$

where the first and second equalities follow from Definition 3 and the inequality follows by direct inspection.

Notice also that the values of the mutual information in lower bounds in Eqs. (4) and (5) can be achieved by the Scrooge measurement and ensemble, respectively, as shown in the proof of Theorem 2. Therefore, when extracting information from a SIC ensemble or by a SIC measurement, the strategy based on the Scrooge construction performs strictly better than the pretty-good one. Note, however, that pretty-good construction was not introduced with respect to accessible information extraction, but aiming to maximize the probability of correct guess.

Finally, as a "numerological" aside, we notice the intriguing fact that the quantity $\frac{2}{d+1}$, appearing in the right hand side of both Eqs. (4) and (5), appears also in a number of other quantities related to SIC POVMs. For example, the *index of coincidence* C, defined for any POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}$ and any state ρ as $C = \sum_y (\mathrm{Tr}[\rho\Pi_y])^2$, is constant and equal to $\frac{2}{d(d+1)}$ in the case of SIC POVMs and pure states [48, 49]. Also, the so-called *quantumness* [33] Q of a Hilbert space, representing the worst-case difficulty of transmitting quantum states through a purely classical communication channel, was shown [50] to be achieved whenever the states to be transmitted constitute a SIC ensemble, in which case $Q = \frac{2}{d+1}$. As a further example, the *total uncertainty* [51] T on the outcome of a complete set of mutually unbiased bases [52] in any prime dimension is known to be lower bounded as $T \geq (d+1)\log\frac{d+1}{2}$, with equality if and only if the input states constitute a SIC ensemble [51].

A. The cases of qubits and qutrits

The following two corollaries prove the tightness of the upper bounds in Eqs. (4) and (5) for qubits and qutrits.

Corollary 1. *Upper bounds in Eqs.* (4) *and* (5) *are tight in dimension* $d = 2$*, namely the* 2*-dimensional SIC ensemble (tetrahedral ensemble)* $\mathcal{E}$ *and the* 2*-dimensional SIC POVM (tetrahedral POVM)* $\mathcal{P}$ *are such that*

$$A(\mathcal{E}) = W(\mathcal{P}) = \log \frac{4}{3}.$$

The accessible information is achieved by the so-called antitetrahedral POVM and the informational power by the so-called antitetrahedral ensemble.

Proof. The POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}_{y=1}^4$ (tetrahedral POVM) with $\Pi_y = \frac{1}{2}|\pi_y\rangle\langle\pi_y|$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi_1\rangle &= |0\rangle, \\
|\pi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|1\rangle, \\
|\pi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle + e^{i\frac{2}{3}\pi}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|1\rangle, \\
|\pi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle + e^{-i\frac{2}{3}\pi}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|1\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

is a SIC POVM in dimension 2.

The ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}_{x=1}^4$ (antitetrahedral ensemble) with $\rho_x = \frac{1}{4}|\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_1\rangle &= |1\rangle, \\
|\psi_2\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|0\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1\rangle, \\
|\psi_3\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|0\rangle + e^{i\frac{1}{3}\pi}\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1\rangle, \\
|\psi_4\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|0\rangle + e^{-i\frac{1}{3}\pi}\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

saturates the upper bound in Eq. (5). Since the average state of the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ is $\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{1}$, due to Lemmas 1 and 2 also the upper bound in Eq. (4) is saturated. □

Corollary 2. *Upper bounds in Eqs.* (4) *and* (5) *are tight in dimension* $d = 3$*, namely there exist a* 3*-dimensional SIC ensemble* $\mathcal{E}$ *and a* 3*-dimensional SIC POVM* $\mathcal{P}$ *such that*

$$A(\mathcal{E}) = W(\mathcal{P}) = \log \frac{3}{2}.$$

The accessible information is achieved by an orthonormal POVM and the informational power by an orthonormal ensemble.

Proof. The POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_y\}_{y=1}^9$ with $\Pi_y = \frac{1}{3}|\pi_y\rangle\langle\pi_y|$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi_1\rangle &= |0\rangle, \\
|\pi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}|1\rangle, \\
|\pi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle - i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}|1\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle, \\
|\pi_5\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle + e^{\frac{2}{3}\pi i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle, \\
|\pi_6\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle + e^{-\frac{2}{3}\pi i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\pi_7\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle, \\
|\pi_8\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle + e^{\frac{2}{3}\pi i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle, \\
|\pi_9\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle - \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle + e^{-\frac{2}{3}\pi i}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

is a SIC POVM in dimension 3. Notice that states $|\pi_i\rangle$ with $i = 1, 2, 3$ lie on a plane on the Bloch sphere, and the same for $i = 4, 5, 6$ and $i = 7, 8, 9$.

The ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho_x\}_{x=1}^3$ with $\rho_x = \frac{1}{3}|\psi_x\rangle\langle\psi_x|$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_1\rangle &= |2\rangle, \\
|\psi_2\rangle &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle, \\
|\psi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

saturates the upper bound in Eq. (5). Notice that $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_1\Pi_y] = 0$ if $y = 1, 2, 3$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_1\Pi_y] = 1/18$ otherwise; $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_2\Pi_y] = 0$ if $y = 4, 5, 6$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_2\Pi_y] = 1/18$ otherwise; $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_3\Pi_y] = 0$ if $y = 7, 8, 9$ and $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_3\Pi_y] = 1/18$ otherwise. Notice also that $\mathcal{E}$ is an orthonormal ensemble. Since the average state of the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ is $\frac{1}{d}\mathbb{1}$, due to Lemmas 1 and 2 also the upper bound in Eq. (4) is saturated. □

Notice how the optimal construction in the case of Corollary 2 is given by orthonormal ensemble and POVM, contrarily to the case of Corollary 1, in which the optimal construction still involves the tetrahedral configuration. An analogous observation was very recently reported also by Szymusiak

in Ref. [29], where a characterization of the maximally informative ensembles for group-covariant three-dimensional SIC POVMs is provided.

We can now compare the bounds provided in Theorem 2 with those provided in Theorem 1. A plot of these bounds as a function of the dimension is provided in Fig. 1. The lower bounds in Eqs. (2) and



FIG. 1. (Color online) Bounds on the accessible information and the informational power as given by Theorems 1 and 2. The upper green line is the upper bound for arbitrary ensembles and POVMs, namely $\log d$. The middle red line is the upper bound for SIC ensembles and SIC POVMs, namely $\log \frac{2d}{d+1}$. The lower blue line is the lower bound for rank-one POVMs, namely $\log(d) - \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \sum_{n=2}^{d} \frac{1}{n}$. The two horizontal black lines are the asymptotes for the latter two quantities.

(3), as well as the upper bounds in Eqs. (4) and (5), are asymptotically finite, namely

$$\log d - \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_{i=2}^{d} \frac{1}{d} \longrightarrow \frac{1-\gamma}{\ln 2} \sim 0.60995,$$

where γ is the Euler constant, and

$$\log \frac{2d}{d+1} \longrightarrow 1.$$

Then, while there exist ensembles (resp., POVMs) whose accessible information (resp., informational power) grows as $\log d$, that of SIC ensembles (resp., SIC POVMs) is asymptotically upper bounded by one bit.

IV. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The purpose of this work was twofold. First, we provided tight upper and lower bounds, depending only on the dimension of the system, on the accessible information and the informational power of any preparation and measurement. While both upper and lower bounds for accessible information can be trivially saturated, we found that, for the case of informational power, the lower bound is saturated by the Scrooge measurement. Second, we focused on the case of SIC preparations and measurements, providing stronger upper and lower bounds on accessible information and informational power, and proved their tightness in the case of qubits and qutrits. As a corollary of our upper bound, we showed that the accessible information and the informational power of SIC preparations and measurements are always upper bounded by one bit. As a corollary of our lower bound, on the other hand, we provided a strategy for the extraction of mutual information from SIC ensembles or by SIC measurements, beating the "pretty-good" one.

Our results can be generalized to arbitrary (in general, not discrete nor continuous) ensembles and POVMs, upon redefining the mutual information in terms of relative entropy [44]. In the most general case, a POVM [16] is defined as an operator valued function $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi(\Delta)\}$ from the collection of Borel subsets on the real line such that $\Pi(\emptyset) = 0$, $\Pi(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{1}$, and for every sequence of disjoint Borel subsets Δ_y one has that $\Pi(\cup_y \Delta_y) = \sum_y \Pi(\Delta_y)$. It should be noted that the sets of discrete and that of continuous POVMs are dense subsets of the set of general POVMs in a suitable weak topology, so that the present definition of accessible information is consistent with that for the general case. The most general definition of ensemble is analogous. The discussion of the most general case is out of the scope of the present manuscript.

We notice that no non-trivial upper and lower bounds on the informational power as functions of the POVM are known (while analogous bounds for the accessible information as function of the ensemble are provided by the Holevo-Yuen-Ozawa bound [16, 22] and the subentropy bound [23]). For any POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_x\}$, the subentropy of the ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{\rho^{1/2}\Pi_x\rho^{1/2}\}$, for any normalized state ρ, is a lower bound on the informational power of $\mathcal{P}$, as it follows immediately from Lemma 1 (see also Refs. [24, 25]). Unfortunately, a general method to maximize over ρ, thus making such bound tighter, is not known.

We conclude our work by adding a few items to the long list of conjectures related to SIC ensembles and SIC POVMs. We start by noticing that in dimension $d \geq 4$ it is not clear whether the upper bounds in Theorem 2 are tight or not. Nonetheless, some

light can be shed by numerical optimization. Indeed, from the proof of Theorem 2 it follows that necessary condition for the upper bound in Eq. (5) to be tight is that the bound $H(Y|X{=}x) \geq \log(d(d{+}1)/2)$ is tight. Then, for the 16 $Z_4 \times Z_4$ covariant 4-dimensional SIC POVMs listed in Ref. [31], we numerically searched for the state ρ_x minimizing the entropy $H(Y|X{=}x)$. We employed a steepest descent algorithm similar to that proposed in Ref. [24] for several (> 1000) seed states chosen with uniform distribution. For any considered POVMs, the optimal state we found has $H(Y|X = x) \sim 3.433$, so the bound $H(Y|X = x) \geq \log 10 \sim 3.322$ is not saturated. If a state saturating such bound does not exist, then the upper bound in Eq. (4) is not tight for $Z_4 \times Z_4$ 4-dimensional SIC POVM.

This rises another intriguing question: is the informational power the same for any SIC POVM in fixed dimension? And also: for any SIC POVM in arbitrary dimension, does there exist a maximally informative ensemble with average state $d^{-1}\mathbb{1}$? Of course, the answer to this question would be affirmative if all SIC POVMs were proved to be covariant under the action of some discrete group. Moreover, if true, due to Lemmas 1 and 2, this would also imply an affirmative answer to the following question: is the informational power of any SIC POVM $\mathcal{P} = \{\Pi_x\}$ equal to the accessible information of the corresponding SIC ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{d^{-1}\Pi_x\}$? We believe that these tantalizing open problems well deserve future investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Giacomo Mauro D'Ariano, Paolo Perinotti, and Massimiliano F. Sacchi for very useful discussions, comments, and suggestions. This work was supported by JSPS (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows No. 24-0219. M.O. and F.B. were supported by the JSPS KAKENHI, No. 26247016. F. B. was supported by the Program for Improvement of Research Environment for Young Researchers from Special Coordination Funds for Promoting Science and Technology (SCF) commissioned by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan.

[1] M. Ozawa, *Sugaku Expositions* (in press), arXiv:1201.5334.
[2] M. A. Ballester and S. Wehner, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 022319 (2007).
[3] I. Bialynicki-Birula, and L. Rudnicki, arXiv:1001.4668.
[4] S. Wehner and A. Winter, New J. Phys. **12**, 025009 (2010).
[5] P. J. Coles, R. Colbeck, L. Yu, and M. Zwolak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 210405 (2012).
[6] F. Buscemi, M. J. W. Hall, M. Ozawa, and M. M. Wilde, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 050401 (2014).
[7] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012311 (2011).
[8] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, AIP Conf. Proc. **1424**, 270 (2012).
[9] F. Buscemi, G. Gour, and J. S. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012324 (2009).
[10] F. Buscemi, New J. Phys. **12**, 123002 (2009).
[11] M. Dall'Arno, G. M. D'Ariano, and M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042315 (2010).
[12] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, *Quantum Information and Communication* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[13] F. Buscemi, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012309 (2008).
[14] G. Chiribella, M. Dall'Arno, G. M. D'Ariano, C. Macchiavello, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 052305 (2011).
[15] D. S. Lebedev, L. B. Levitin, Information and Control **9**, 1 (1966).
[16] A. S. Holevo, J. Multivariate Anal. **3**, 337 (1973).
[17] V. P. Belavkin, Stochastics **1**, 315 (1975).
[18] V. P. Belavkin, Radio Engineering and Electronic Physics **20**, 39 (1975).
[19] E. B. Davies, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **24**, 596 (1978).
[20] M. Ozawa, J. Math Phys. **25**, 79 (1984).
[21] M. Ozawa, J.Math. Phys. **27**, 759 (1986).
[22] H. P. Yuen and M. Ozawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 363 (1993).
[23] R. Jozsa, D. Robb, and W. K Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 668 (1994).
[24] M. Dall'Arno, G. M. D'Ariano, and M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062304 (2011).
[25] O. Oreshkov, J. Calsamiglia, R. Muñoz-Tapia, and E. Bagan, New J. Phys. **13**, 073032 (2011).
[26] A. S. Holevo, Problems of Information Transmission **48**, 1 (2012).
[27] A. S. Holevo, Phys. Scr. **2013**, 014034 (2013).
[28] W. Słomczyński and A. Szymusiak, arXiv:1402.0375v1.
[29] A. Szymusiak, arXiv:1405.0052v1.
[30] C. M. Caves, http://info.phys.unm.edu/∼caves/reports/infopovm.pdf.

[31] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 2171 (2004). Notice that the expression for coefficient r_0 in Eq. (26) therein is incorrect, and should be replaced with $r_0 = \frac{\sqrt{1-1/\sqrt{5}}}{2\sqrt{2-\sqrt{2}}}$.
[32] D. M. Appleby, S. T. Flammia, and C. A. Fuchs, J. Math. Phys. **52**, 022202 (2011).
[33] C. A. Fuchs and M. Sasaki, Quantum Inf. Comput. **3**, 377 (2003).
[34] J. Řeháček, B.-G. Englert, and D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 052321 (2004).
[35] J. M. Renes, Quantum Inf. Comput. **5**, 80 (2005).
[36] M. Ziman and V. Bužek, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 022343 (2005).
[37] M. A. Ballester, arXiv:quant-ph/0507073.
[38] I. H. Kim, Quantum Inf. Comput. **7**, 730 (2007).
[39] A. J. Scott, J. Phys. A **39**, 13507 (2006).
[40] P. Hausladen and W. K. Wootters, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 2385 (1994).
[41] M. J. W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 100 (1997).
[42] F. Buscemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 180501 (2007)
[43] F. Buscemi and M. Horodecki, Open Systems & Information Dynamics **16**, 29 (2009).
[44] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Hoboken, Wiley-Interscience, 2006).
[45] S. Sykora, J. Stat. Phys. **11**, 17 (1974).
[46] S. Sternberg, *Group Theory and Physics* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995).
[47] M. Ozawa, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences **21**, 279 (1985).
[48] A. E. Rastegin, Eur. Phys. J. D 67, 269 (2013). See in particular Proposition 6 therein.
[49] A. Klappenecker, M. Roetteler, Proceedings 2005 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT 2005), 1740 (2005).
[50] C. A. Fuchs, Quantum Information & Computation **4**, 467 (2004).
[51] D. M. Appleby, H. B. Dang, and C. A. Fuchs, Entropy **16**, 1484 (2014).
[52] I. D. Ivonovic, J. Phys. Math. Gen. **14**, 3241 (1981).